



IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
GREENVILLE DIVISION

RUFUS JULIUS CORNELIUS ANDERSON,	§
Plaintiff,	§
	§
vs.	§ CIVIL ACTION NO. 6:16-00761-MGL-JDA
	§
KAREN PATTERSON; MIRANDA B.	§
PIERCE WARE; JOHN SIMMONS;	§
LETITIA VERDIN; DAVID FISHER;	§
ALEX KINLAW; PATRICIA FULLER;	§
and E. F. IRICK,	§
Defendants.	§

ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
AND DISMISSING DEFENDANTS LETITIA VERDIN, DAVID FISHER,
AND ALEX KINLAW FROM THIS ACTION WITHOUT PREJUDICE
AND WITHOUT ISSUANCE AND SERVICE OF PROCESS

This case was filed as a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action. Plaintiff is proceeding pro se. The matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (Report) of the United States Magistrate Judge suggesting that the Court dismiss Defendants Letitia Verdin, David Fisher, and Alex Kinlaw from this action without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. The Report was made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo

determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The Magistrate Judge filed the Report on April 12, 2016, but Plaintiff failed to file any objections to the Report. “[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note). Moreover, a failure to object waives appellate review. *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841, 845-46 (4th Cir. 1985).

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case pursuant to the standard set forth above, the Court adopts the Report and incorporates it herein. Therefore, it is the judgment of the Court that Defendants Letitia Verdin, David Fisher, and Alex Kinlaw are **DISMISSED** from the action without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Signed this 2nd day of May, 2016, in Columbia, South Carolina.

s/ Mary Geiger Lewis
MARY GEIGER LEWIS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this Order within thirty days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.